Application No. 10/556,918

Amdt. Dated: September 4, 2008

Reply to Office Action Dated: July 11, 2008

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the final Office Action mailed July 11, 2008. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are pending, claims 1 and 6 have been amended, and claim 21 has been added; and
- Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trotel (US 5,022,060) in view of Yu (US 6,094,473) and in further view of Brunnett (US 4,052,620).
   The objection and rejection are discussed below.

# The Objection to Claims 7-20

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 7-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 10, which depends from independent claim 6, has been incorporated into claim 6, and claim 10 has been cancelled herein. Hence, claim 6 and claims 7-9 and 11-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

## The Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trotel in view of Yu, and further in view of Brunnett. As discussed *supra*, allowable subject matter (claim 10) has been incorporated into claim 6, rendering claim 6 allowable. Thus, this rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn. Claim 1 recites limitations similar to those recited in claim 6. Applicant has amended claim 1 herein with aspects of claim 10. As such, it is believed that claim 1 and claims 2-5, which depend therefrom, are also allowable, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection thereto.

## Claim 21

Newly added claim 21 includes aspects recited in claim 6 and claim 7 (which depends from claim 6). As noted *supra*, the Office has indicated that such a combination would be allowable. Thus, entry and allowance of claim 21 is kindly requested.

Application No. 10/556,918 Amdt. Dated: September 4, 2008

Reply to Office Action Dated: July 11, 2008

# Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony M. Del Zoppo, III Reg. No. 51,606

Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co, L.P.A.

38500 Chardon Road

Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094

Phone: 1.440.391.5100 Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:
Thomas M. Lundin, Reg. No. 48,979
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
595 Miner Road

Cleveland, Ohio 44143 Phone: 1.440.483.4281 Fax: 1.440.483.2452